UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

Who Does Things?

By CHARLES F. DOLE

Is Jane Addams A Menace?

By EDWIN D. MEAD

A Great Indian Scholar

By J. T. SUNDERLAND

VOLUME XCVI NUMBER 22

Chicago, February 15, 1926

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES : *Editors* : FRANCIS NEILSON

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
ZONA GALE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
H. R. MUSSEY
FANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE Pamphlet Mission FOR FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER IN RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:
ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBBINS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
David Starr Jordan
Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
George Saranton
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
CANADA—Sidney Snow
CHINA—Gilbert Reid
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Guglielmo Lucidi
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoka
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY Fellowship Associates
BOND OF UNION

We, the undersigned, believing in the association of all men and women who are in sympathy with the aims and ideals set forth in the Announcement printed November 3rd, 1921, do invite all who wish to co-operate to join in a world-wide fellowship that has no bounds of race or creed.

The name of this fellowship is The Unity Fellowship Associates and its purpose is the interpretation of the Religion of Democracy. Membership means a declaration of sympathy and interest. There are no dues. Members may make voluntary contributions which will be used for the purpose of making known the aims of the Fellowship and the publication of its literature.

UNITY will be the organ of this Fellowship and all members will be requested, though not compelled, to be subscribers.

Lists of the members will be sent to all members so that they may be known to one another. Local groups may be formed wherever there exists a sufficient number and there is the desire to do so.

All persons who desire to become members may do so by sending their names to UNITY, care of Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, Ill.

Name.....

Address.....

To UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY,
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago.
Gentlemen:
Enclosed you will find check for which please enter my subscription to UNITY for one year.

Mr. (Mrs. or Miss).....

Address.....

Rates: $3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription. Single copies 10 cents.

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 339
Who Does Things?—REV. CHARLES F. DOLE... 341
Jottings—J. H. H..... 343
Editorial Correspondence: American Notes—REV. SYDNEY STRONG..... 344

ARTICLES—
Selected—ARTHUR PONSONBY..... 339
Is Jane Addams a Menace?—EDWIN D. MEAD. 345
To American Friends—*M. K. Gandhi*..... 347
A Great Indian Scholar—J. T. SUNDERLAND... 349

THE STUDY TABLE—
"Black Cameos"—MARY WHITE OVINGTON..... 350
Good Sermons—J. H. H..... 349
Note—"Year Book" of New York Craftsman's Group 350

THE FIELD—
Committee on Militarism in Education..... 351
The White Cross, How It Started, What It Is Doing, What It Proposes..... 351

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME XCVI MONDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1926 NUMBER 22

Yes, I am against the next war *now*, because *I know* it will be a sham fight, with the wrong forces drawn up in conflict against one another; because *I know* severe punishment will come not to the culprits, but to the innocent; because *I know* nothing will be settled by it, and only scoundrels will gain by it; and because I believe warfare is a resort to barbaric violence and a spiritual and economic outrage on mankind. Yes, indeed, I am against all war between nations, because I am convinced there can be no cause of international dispute which can justify the loss of millions of lives and the wholesale destruction of cities and of irreplaceable national treasures.

—*Arthur Ponsonby*, in "Now Is the Time."

Let it be said, in all fairness that the World Court advocates put up a gallant fight and won an impressive victory. We are only sorry that they won so little for all their efforts. The Court, as we have pointed out so often, and as even the most ardent proponents of the tribunal themselves admitted in debate, is of little practical efficacy toward the accomplishment of peace. It is nothing but a "gesture," to use President Coolidge's amazing word, and a feeble one at that. Now, when to this basic fact, inherent in the very character of the Court, is added the further fact of "reservations," it is evident that what the United States has done through the action of the Senate amounts to practically nothing. It is difficult for us to conceive, under the conditions laid down for the entrance of our country into the Court, of any question bearing the seeds of war which we would be willing to submit to the Court's adjudication. Granted for the sake of argument that there might be some such question submitted, it is still more difficult for us to conceive of this country accepting any decision of the Court which was not consistent with our preconceived ideas of justice and the right. In other words, we are reserving in this case elements of choice, of acceptance or rejection, which are utterly inconsistent with the whole idea of the Court as a court. Which means that, so far as the United States is concerned, or the rest of the world in lesser degree, for that matter, we are no more committed to the system of judicial settlement of international disputes than we were before. Of course, it is something to have the judicial principle talked about and recognized, as it is something to have an international organization that even masquerades as a court. But this is what we used to say in the days before the War, when the Hague Court instead of the World Court held the center of the stage. We are never going to get very far upon the road to peace so long as we are satisfied with halfway or imitation measures of this kind. War is terrific business; and if we are ever going to get rid of it, it must be by means as thorough-going, if not actually as terrific, as itself. We like the saying of the Quakers:

> Only love and mercy and terrific virtue can bring a terrific thing like peace.

It is a melancholy thing to read in the reports of the All-India National Congress, held during Christmas week, of the appeal made for military training and organization by the President of the Congress, Mrs. Sarojini Naidu. Her speech was in large part a declaration in favor of a full return to the Gandhi program of non-cooperation. "In her sweet, silvery tone," writes a personal correspondent, "with all her fine lyrical enthusiasm, Mrs. Naidu condemned the policy of the Government of India." If a change does not come, she said, "all members must obey the clarion call of the Congress and leave the assembly halls and the legislative chambers in the provinces." This, of course, is a direct forecast of the failure of the *Swarajist* political program which was adopted in the last Congress, under the leadership of the late C. R. Das, as a substitute for the unbending Gandhi program of non-cooperation. Our correspondent recognizes this when he goes on to say, "Mrs. Naidu thus reiterates the policy of the Gandhian boycott of the councils. The logical concomitant of such a boycott is a campaign of universal civil disobedience, the non-payment of taxes, etc." This is a swing back, in other words, after the brief Das interregnum, to Gandhi once again! At the same time, by a curious, an almost unaccountable inconsistency, Mrs. Naidu, while thus calling for a return to non-cooperation all along the line urged or seemed to urge an abandonment of non-violence. "In the course of her speech," says our correspondent, "she said that the youths of the country should be educated on military lines 'to defend their hearths and homes.' . . . She endorsed the idea of a federation of Asiatic peoples against the white aggression. She asked the Congress to form a national militia of Congress volunteers." This is deplorable, especially as coming from Mrs. Naidu. Just for this reason, however, does it indicate that even the noblest of the Indians are being pressed to the breaking point, and that, if the West persists in its policy of force and violence, such policy will inevitably breed force and violence against itself. But we still trust in Gandhi! As non-cooperation was abandoned, only to bring failure, so non-

violence may be suspended, with the same disastrous result. In the end there must and will be a return again to Gandhi's methods. Non-violence and non-cooperation are the two wings which sustain the bird of Indian freedom. Break either one, and the bird must flutter to the earth.

It is amusing to note the official English interpretation of this situation in India, as presented, for example, in the recent report of Professor L. F. Rushbrook Williams to the British Parliament. Professor Williams sees what Mrs. Naidu sees—the failure of the *Swarajist* policy of political action. "Alone," he says, "the Swarajists were not powerful enough really to cripple the representative bodies." Furthermore (just as Gandhi prophesied!) the *Swarajists,* once inside the legislative assemblies, began to temper their opposition to English rule, and thus more and more go over to the enemy. Now all this Professor Williams uses as argument to prove that Gandhi's power is waning in India. Does he not know that the *Swarajist* policy was one which Gandhi consistently opposed—to which he acceded only because, in the greatness of his spirit, he would not deny to others the right to try their methods—and the failure of which he foretold and anticipated from the beginning? When Gandhi voluntarily yielded leadership to C. R. Das and the *Swarajists* something over a year ago, he instantly gained permanently in spiritual power all and more than he lost temporarily in political power. Now, with the collapse of the *Swarajist* methods, the whole movement of revolt swings back again to Gandhi, as witness the Presidential address of Mrs. Naidu quoted above. Gandhi's position, in other words, is stronger than ever —his personal influence and prestige never so potent. Let there be no doubt about that! On the other hand, there is unquestioned discouragement and loss of morale in India over the prospects of gaining self-government in any appreciable period of time. The independence movement, in other words, if not the personal influence of its great and exalted leader, is losing ground. Professor William's report produces valid evidence in substantiation of this fact. Nothing that he says, however, is so significant as Mrs. Naidu's playing with the desperate idea of military training. Never would such a woman resort to such a weapon if she had not become disheartened to an extent greater than she herself realizes. Indian hopes have been running too high. The English nut is hard to crack. All of which means a situation perfectly adapted to the spiritual discipline of patience, courage and self-control, of which Gandhi is the supreme exemplar! More than ever at this moment is the Mahatma the man of the hour.

We hope that it is not too late to comment upon the acquittal of Richard Ford in California. For the first time there is a turn in the tide of injustice and persecution in that state, and a recognition once again of some of the elementary principles of American liberty. Twelve years ago Ford was a hop-picker on a ranch in the Golden State. The conditions under which he and his fellow-workers, men and women both, were toiling had long been intolerable. Ford, who was an I. W. W., knew something about unionism, and he tried to organize the hop-pickers for their own protection. The owner of the ranch resisted; there was hard feeling, disturbance, rioting, and finally death. Ford, who had admittedly slain nobody, was arrested on a charge of conspiracy to kill, was tried, convicted, and sent to prison. Paroled a few months ago, he was promptly rearrested on an indictment for slaying a second man in the rioting, and placed on trial for his life a second time. The Governor showed his interest in the case by naming one of the most notorious labor-haters on the California bench to be the presiding judge. This man's conduct of the case was from the beginning to end an open support of the prosecution. In spite of this and other unfavorable facts, the jury, after deliberating 77 hours, returned a verdict of "not guilty," and Richard Ford was freed. The crime of this worker, of course, was not murder, or conspiracy, or anything else. It was simply and solely membership in the I. W. W. and activity in the interests of labor. Like Anita Whitney, he was punished not for anything done, but for his associations and opinions. This is a new idea of crime, common during the Great War, but now pretty much confined to California. The acquittal of Ford would seem to indicate that even this state is beginning to be ashamed of itself, and is thinking of resuming its place in the American Union. Let California release Mooney and Billings, free Anita Whitney, and empty San Quentin of its political offenders, and her name can once again be restored to honor.

The National Council of the Episcopal Church has voted to join forces with the Roman Catholic Church in combating federal legislation concerning birth control. The Executive Committee of the National Lutheran Council, on the other hand, has voted not to take part in birth control controversies. It is to be noted that the initiative in this matter is being assumed by the Roman Catholic Church. Thus the action of both of these important church bodies was taken in answer to a request for help from Rev. John J. Burke, a Paulist father, General Secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Council. The opposition of the Catholics to birth control is, of course, well known. How far the Catholics will get in lining up the Protestants is doubtful. Our own guess is that they will succeed pretty well with those Protestant bodies which take the traditional attitude toward women, as see the Episcopal Church, but that they will fail just in proportion as churches recognize women on equal terms

with men in membership, administration, and spiritual leadership. For birth control is fundamentally a woman's movement. To see a lot of men sitting around deciding that women must have as many children as the passions of men may force upon them, is to us one of the most sickening sights upon this planet. We would like to have these men go into the business of bearing and rearing children for a little while, and *then* see what they would think about birth control. Which reminds us of the old and profoundly true conundrum, "How many children would a family have if the mother and father alternated in giving birth?" Answer—three; first a child by the mother, then a child by the father, then a second child by the mother, then—no more! The father would balk. Once is enough—never again! Of course, there are other sides to the birth control problem, as, for example, the economic, where the man is vitally and perhaps, in our present industrial order, primarily concerned. Beyond this is the welfare of the race, a central question. But at bottom is *the right of the woman to control her function of motherhood.* When celibate priests, and men generally, attempt to intrude upon this problem, they should be respectfully but none the less firmly invited to withdraw.

Havelock Ellis, whose birthday is being celebrated this month, holds a position unique among the great leaders of our time. He is not an outstanding popular figure, like Wells or Shaw, known to the man in the street as a name if not as a person. He is not an embattled prophet, like Bertrand Russell or the late E. D. Morel, striking mighty blows in the fray for righteousness, and bearing away the cruel scars of combat. He is not a philosopher like Bergson or a scientist like Einstein, whose creative ideas mark an epoch in the history of ordered thought. Not distinctive in any of these ways, Havelock Ellis is something rarer and finer. Himself the perfect distillation of everything best in our civilization, he has for years been an influence, pervasive as the atmosphere and as unintrusive, making for "whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report." In certain fields of inquiry, such as the sex problem, Mr. Ellis has of course done original work of a high order. In certain reforms, such as birth control, his vision and valor have been indispensable. But not here is his primary and ever-memorable service to his generation. What he has done, through some gift of temperament or some high discipline of spirit, is to enfranchise his own life, to develop within himself the whole man, and then, by serene testimony to the wisdom he has found, to bestow the secret on those ready and able to receive it. More fully than any other man of whom we know, Havelock Ellis has discovered and revealed what life ought to be and may well be. To enter into his presence is to feel oneself lifted up on to those heights where some day shall stand the race, freed, cleansed, ennobled, strong in the knowledge and happy in the enjoyment of the more abundant life.

Who Does Things?

"Oh, why should the spirit of mortal be proud?"

Here is the vast central question of the Universe. Everywhere things are going on; things are being done, and on an infinite scale. Innumerable creatures are at work around us of types that no man can number. They live in the light and they work in the darkness. They live upon bigger creatures and inside of one another, and they challenge our most penetrating microscopes. In the earth beneath and the stars above incessant motion goes on. Most interesting of all things is what we men are about. Does it mean anything? What does it mean? Who does it? This course of events that we call human history—what is behind it? Does it carry any message? From where? From what, or whom? Concerning Good or Evil? What if there is a message and a meaning? What if it is a clear and simple and very beautiful message. What if it plays from a real and *bona fide* intelligence upon our tiny minds? In every stage of the development of religion there has been an approach to this thought.

Listen to the glowing words of the ancient seers and thinkers:

"Lift up your eyes on high and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their host by numbers; he calleth them all by names by the greatness of his might, for that he is strong in power; not one faileth."

Can anyone find in literature anything more startling and moving, or more thoughtful? Or, quaint as the words are, can you think of anything ever said more likely to be the essence of the central message of the Universe to the dawning mind of man?

"I form the light and create darkness * * * I have made the earth and created men upon it: I have stretched out the heavens and all their host have I commanded."

Anthropomorphic! Of course it is and must be! Is this a reason why it does not carry the truth of things? men say.

But this is an age of science, and we expect more substantial answers to our seeking after truth than the brightest of our fathers could know. Will science tell us that things make themselves? That the stars created themselves? That things conspired together to produce a Universe? That colonies of amoeba started off aeons ago by themselves to write poems and compose constitutions? Has science had the slightest success in

investigating the mysteries of the origins of things? Where has science put up any negative over against that majestic challenge to the intelligence of the world: *In the beginning, God?*

We may at least, however, many seem to claim, take over to our credit what we men have done and are learning to do. We at least do things. No one just now can measure the bulk and the quality of the things which, guided by science, we can yet do in making over this old earth to fit the purposes of our evolving civilization.

We men do things, do we? Original things? Such as what? We have in mind a genius, an Edison, if one chooses. No one is so preposterous as to say that he made himself. Where did he get his inventive mind? The greater the genius, the more incredible that he could have fitted it up for himself. Take the case of the singer; what made the rare voice, the sense of the harmony, or the spiritual sympathy without which the most gifted singer must sing to empty hearts?

Does not the man, however, contribute the patience to receive discipline, the purpose to improve, the will to succeed, the "characteristic gifts" of perhaps a long family of artists? This is to go deeper yet into the waters. Who makes the patience, the purpose, the forceful will, the integrity? Who creates a lovable character, or more subtle yet, the good will which opens the way to all hearts?

We call a young girl silly, who is vain of her beauty. Doubtless in her case this is a pure gift of heaven. She may be glad and happy in it as she might be if a dear uncle gave her a diamond ring. Does her beauty, however, differ at all in its origin from the intellect, the wit, the determination, the control over weaker men, out of which as a working capital many a man is lifted to eminence among his fellows and actually flatters himself that he has made his success! How can anyone look at the truth and ever be proud, or harbor conceit? Surely of all men who live, the so-called "self-made man" owes most to the gifts simply showered upon him. Does he ever say: "See this great Babylon which I have built?" Then he is close to the slippery ice down which all kinds of conceit tumble to ruin.

We can therefore hardly understand the light optimism by which men imagine that they and others like them, mere men, expect to steer the march of human progress to heights of betterment, by themselves, ignoring any Master of Life or eternal giver of wisdom, and thinking to find in the physical sciences new secrets of education to which men can help themselves, without the use of reverence or modesty. The story of the last two decades ought to hold good to teach the tremendous lesson how small all the great men of the earth are in and by themselves, where no great leader appears to interpret and to do the will of the Eternal, in those spiritual terms through which alone can any human success ever be won!

Has man then no more originating power of his own than the beasts and the insects? Has he nothing unique and inspiringly wonderful in himself that no other creature has? Let us watch him closely, or rather, watch ourselves, especially at such times as life most fully and effectively possesses us. At our best, we seem to be spectators of the Universe. Our minds are receivers of a colossal wireless system. We have monitions, warnings, and openings of light and thought. Besides this, we are citizens and actors and artists and creators in a fashion. Some of us even expect to produce life. But observe, the most brilliant of us does nothing and can do nothing except by way of imitation and enlightening suggestion caught from nature. Suppose even that a scientist actually set up a living creature in his laboratory. He would only be doing that in which he followed at every step the clue of that invisible mind in whose thought and skill he is a sharer.

We can only think in figures and likenesses. Do not the figures, however, such as offer themselves, make the impression that the characteristic and standing wonder about man is, that he is at the same time a spectator and an actor himself in relation to the splendid spectacle of the universe? In other words, he shares the spectacle like one who is at the beck and call of the management.

This idea seems at once to fit into and hinge upon that magnificent central proposition of thought, namely, the originating and creative life—at once illuminating thought and purposive power. The questioning mind in us seeks that which is and always was, and endures, beyond which no question can pass. The mind seeks for a resting place, and can somehow never be satisfied except in the consciousness of a kinship in the eternal. Man thus finds himself, at his utmost stretch of consciousness, a sharer in and with God. Man does things as a sharer in the doings of the Creative Life.

Is there any use or good in these almost overwhelming thoughts? Yes. Much good. In the first place, in the thorough purging of our minds of conceit, vanity, and pride, and those acts and gestures and disabling human contacts, wherein pride spoils our normal social relations and cuts us off from the free flow of love. Resting back in the grip of the truth, we make no longer any pretense, such as children make, that we turn the wheels around; we ask no praise or thanks or rewards from anyone; we set up no claims to comfort our hurt feelings. But we simply seek to see the wonderful spectacle before us, and then to do whatever the commanding forces bid us do. This is life, satisfying and inspiring; it gives us continual gladness. What higher rank do we wish for than to know ourselves as "fellow workers with God?" What enlargement of life to be rid of the petty and selfish *meum* and *tuum* which clutter the intermediate region

of human life between the joyous innocence of the children and the entrance of the eager minds of grown men into their maturity as Sons of God. This is the natural banishment of envy and covetousness.

The emphasis of all this lies in the broadening fields of human conduct and brotherhood. Think of yourself as, at your best, a sharer of the divine workmanship. What is this workmanship? It embraces everything which has to do with human welfare. We conceive of the Will of God as nothing less than the rule and extension of every form of spiritual gladness and perfection. We can think of nothing so satisfying as to receive the spark of goodness, or good will and to pass it on and awaken the same wherever kindly, thoughtful or brotherly life exists to cheer, to hearten, and to comfort. We can think of no such far-reaching and inexhaustible uses of material things and natural forces, lent to us into which to translate our noblest spiritual motions, than when we mould this otherwise refractory stuff and turn on otherwise turbulent forms of power, and learn to "subdue the earth" to the making of a happy manhood, body and soul acting together in harmony and beauty.

Does not this idea both of God and man play the mischief with the common conception of sin? Is it not enough to think of sin as disease, infirmity, ignorance, feebleness? And does not this shut our mouths against blaming one another or ever wishing to punish other men? It certainly does. But wherever does the current idea of sin work to help us love one another? Or, how does blame serve to open the saving flood gates of good will? What helps us all, however, is modesty and reverence. In homes where the children begin to grow toward the light, in every school house where the world trains its citizens in public spirit, for a fuller usefulness, in the care of the ill-born and the backward, in the new ideals of all interracial and international relations throughout the world, it helps us immensely to learn gentleness and patience, and to be rid of fear or envy, as between the stronger and feebler—it helps us as nothing else does help to recognize one another as in a sense, children all, like one another too in the divine susceptibility to open our heart to a good word or a smile; it helps us wonderfully also to become keen to discover everywhere among men gleams of the same light of the common humanity as we possess at our best; it does us the greatest good to admire and look up and maintain hope in our hearts; and it makes our souls thrill from time to time to reflect that the whole meaning of the universe lies in the kinship with God by which we dare to say and love to say: "It is He that hath made us and not we ourselves."

CHARLES F. DOLE.

Jottings

We quote a statement from Norman Thomas:

"Two British freighters were in trouble in a howling winter's gale. Two liners, one American and one German, went to their rescue. The storm was so violent that the heroism of the rescuers was only partially successful. But how the story of their struggle lifts up the human spirit! Only a few years ago, British and American seamen, perhaps some of them these very men, were at war against the Germans. Now Germans and Americans go to the rescue of their British comrades in one great struggle against nature's fury. Men capable of such fellowship in heroism are too good ever to be sacrificed on the altar of national greed and hate."

After thorough discussion, the men students at Ohio State University voted 1,099 to 701 for optional as against compulsory military training. This follows upon the still more emphatic repudiation of compulsory military training by the students of the College of the City of New York. We wish that the faculties and trustees of such institutions had the courage of the Cleveland School Board, which has thrown out military training altogether.

Mr. Van der Weyde, in his new "Life of Thomas Paine," says that his (Paine's) father was "industrious and poor" (page 2). This phrase, like the traditional "poor but honest," always sets us wondering. Why, in any society that pretends to be just or efficiently organized, should any man be industrious and yet poor? Why should not the quality of industriousness guarantee income?

Mrs. Besant, the great Theosophist leader of India, is continuing magnificently her campaign for a universal religion. She has recently proclaimed afresh her policy of spiritual brotherhood for all mankind. The Theosophists have built a shrine of all religions at Madras, and others in other places are in course of construction.

The late W. L. George never impressed us as a great, even a sincere, literary artist. But he did one thing for which we shall never cease to be grateful. We refer to his study of the conscientious objector in his novel, "Blind Alley." This is the best statement of the case in contemporary fiction, so far as we can recall, and it is all the more remarkable in that George himself was not a sympathizer with this extreme pacifist attitude.

Now that the World Court advocates have won their fight in the Senate, they may confidently be expected to start at once a new fight for the entrance of the United States into the League of Nations. Nor do we see how anybody can complain or object, least of all the anti-League senators who voted for the Court. The two things, Court and League, obviously belong together, and the World Court people are entirely right in seeing and using their victory as a first step toward Geneva.

J. H. H.

American Notes

[Editorial Correspondence.]

I

What are American children reading? This is certainly an interesting as well as important question. The research department of the public schools of a small town (Winnetka, Illinois) has made a survey showing that no work is too big for a small community to undertake, at least to initiate. The result of this research is supposed to be the first children's book list to be prepared, not on guess work, nor on the preferences of teachers and parents, but upon the choices of the children themselves. It was an effort on a large scale "to determine what books are being read and enjoyed by children of various ages and degrees of reading ability. Ballots were sent out to 360,750 children, living all over the country, from Massachusetts to New Mexico, asking their cooperation. It seems that more than 100,000 ballots were returned to the research department. Of these 53,000 were filled out on 800 books, each of which had the 25 or more ballots necessary to bring it within the study. More ballots came from girls than from boys, and there was also a tendency for girls to have a higher degree of reading ability.

Here is the list of the books that American boys and girls love best, arranged in the order of the popularity, the children being grouped according to grades in school: *Fourth Grade*—Grimm's "Fairy Tales," Stevenson's "Garden of Verse," Bannerman's "Little Black Sambo"; *Fifth Grade*—"Pinocchio," Lofting's "Story of Dr. Dolittle," Mulock-Craik's "Little Lame Prince"; *Sixth Grade*—"Heidi," "Robinson Crusoe," "Blue Fairy Book"; *Seventh Grade*—"Adventures of Tom Sawyer," Alcott's "Little Women," Dodge's "Hans Brinker"; *Eighth Grade*—Twain's "Prince and the Pauper," "Seton's "Wild Animals I Have Known," Scott's "Ivanhoe"; *Ninth Grade*—Masefield's "Jim Davis," Dana's "Two Years Before the Mast," Olivant's "Bob, Son of Battle"; *Tenth Grade*—Dumas's "Three Musketeers." The children were asked to write on their ballots answers to questions which would indicate whether the book read was "one of the best ever read" or whether it was "not so interesting," or a decided "I don't like it" or "is too easy" or is "just about right" or is "a little hard" or "too hard." The pedagogical value of this research lies in the fact that in order to be helpful to the children in their reading, adults should begin as a basis with the books that the children "like." In fact the experts' opinions differed quite radically with the choices of the children as to the literary merit of some of the books, yet not often, nor generally. The American Library Association promises to publish the Winnetka Graded Book List, with a full introduction.

II

Not far from this town of Winnetka is another and larger town, that of Evanston. It is a suburb of Chicago, the seat of a big Methodist university, noted for religious fervor as well as learning,—and occasionally turns out a winning football team. At the beginning of this month there was held there a conference that has attracted the attention of the nation.

"A thousand church students, selected by no one but themselves, came in response to their announced purpose to evaluate the church as a definite expression in organization and action of the teachings of Jesus, with the end in view of working in it and through it if possible. They came in worn-out 'flivvers,' freight cars, by hitch-hiking, and in Pullmans dressed in furs and fine linens from 150 colleges and scores of religious denominations."

It came near being a spontaneous uprising of youth, and as such is significant. America has no youth movements as yet, like Germany and other European lands. For four days they talked and milled around and resolved, and at the close voted that it was "good thing to be here" and appointed "a continuation committee." There were a few "adult" speakers, but only those were gladly heard who struck the note of youth. There were 300 gagged official observers in the galleries looking down while the nearly thousand young men and women, of several colors and races, were frankly speaking about the church. These officials were a bit suspicious of parts of the proceedings. Meetings like this conference are likely to be repeated in America.

The most insistent demand on the part of these students, making its appearance frequently in the discussions, was for organic church union. It was unanimously resolved that all the young people's organizations of Protestantism be unified. It was repeatedly stressed that a radical change should be made in "missions." Christians in all lands should be placed on a "mutuality basis." Americans should cease "trying to export American Christianity abroad and instead join in a fellowship of Christians in all lands on a mutual basis." What these thousand "friendly rebels" wanted is somewhat as follows: simpler standards of living by Christian students, excommunication of war, refusal on the part of the church to be used henceforth as a medium of preparation for or prosecution of war, abolition of military training in church schools and in high schools, the guaranteeing to every individual the right to follow the guidance of his own conscience when that conscience advises against participation in war, the absolute separation of missions from political influence and Western materialism.

One of the leaders in the conference declared,

"A new movement is now under way. Never again will a thousand students assemble under their own management to inquire into the church, without coming with more facts and better informed. To help them know the church is the task of the church. No other organization can or will do this, and if the churches turn this job over to some other group, they may expect a resolution next time,—'Be it resolved that the churches be abolished.'"

This mass-meeting of "friendly insurgents" is interpreted as a storm signal which old sailors of the ship of church will be likely to heed. They frankly faced and debated the race problem, with Negro delegates taking part, and declared that the present relations were flatly inconsistent with the mind and teachings of Jesus, and that as far as they were concerned, it was a problem that should be settled on their "own campuses" and in their "own country." They got the truth and facts from a Negro girl from Texas who swept the conference as she expressed the surging emotion of an injured, abused race. They went on record also as favoring radical changes in the teaching of eugenics concerning birth control and the segregation of those who, by heredity, are mentally unfit. The signifi-

cance of the "rebel" conference is to be found in its spontaneity, its wide reach geographically and denominationally. Like those at the Pentecost assembly, they came "from every nation under heaven."

III

American workers are paid better and enjoy better conditions of life probably than the workers of any other land. The average worker goes to his work in an automobile, comes home to a bath-tub and draws the highest weekly wage in the world. He is described as being "a little capitalist"—and he really is, in fact and in mentality. The picture would not be complete if we stopped with this. The industrial system in America produces many workers who work long hours—not a few thousands who work twelve hours a day, not a few thousands who hardly ever enjoy a holiday. The American system works longer and more intensely than elsewhere,—and thousands of workers suffer. For instance, Dr. J. K. Hart, educator, calls attention to a news item that appeared in the *New York World*, to the effect that,

"Lawrence Lynch took his first day off from work in fifty years. Since he was 26 years old he has driven a grain and feed truck He helped out as a night watchman, too, so he got no holidays. But yesterday was a real day off without responsibilities of any sort. Lawrence Lynch got up early to miss none of it. He came down to the stable and loafed all day. Once the grizzled Irishman sighed and his face took on an almost wistful look. 'Gosh,' he said, 'but I'd like to go for a good long buggy ride.'"

But, remarked Dr. Hart, he could not go for a good long buggy ride, because he could not get away from his job. "The workingman," says Dr. Hart, "is framed in his job." So, while American workers enjoy higher wages and conditions, they are in thousands of cases, denied the benefits and joys of leisure. According to Dr. Hart, what makes the story of Lawrence Lynch significant is not its uniqueness, but "its universality: he is but an exaggerated picture of us all." He is "framed in his job"—and this "job" while drawing good pay is often very exacting and intense.

IV

A steamer for the Orient yesterday carried among its passengers H. S. Firestone, Jr.—of rubber tire fame—and Rev. Cleveland Kleihaurer, on a mission to the Philippines. The morning paper carried huge pictures of them both, in close juxtaposition. Mr. Kleihaurer is going to study changing conditions in the Oriental field; Mr. Firestone, to transact company business. Someone remarked, "Yes, here is the old combination, in new form. Now it is Rubber and Missions—going out to evangelize and civilize the nations." This, I thought, is also a picture of America. These two men represent two forces in America that are tremendously affecting human life here,—and probably throughout the earth. When in the "same boat"—they are worth watching.

SIDNEY STRONG.

Is Jane Addams a Menace?

Jane Addams, who has recently been acclaimed by a popular vote "the best beloved woman in America," recently spent some days in Boston speaking in behalf of preparedness for peace. On Saturday she addressed the Women's City Club; on Sunday she spoke at the Old South Forum, and on Monday she spoke at the luncheon of the Women's League for Peace at the Twentieth Century Club. Everywhere she was listened to by great throngs of serious and admiring people who revere her for her long years of devoted service to her country and mankind. The Old South Meeting House was filled, and hundreds had to be turned away, and the attendance at the luncheon at the Twentieth Century Club was limited only by the size of the hall. All who heard her went away with a more exalted patriotism, more enlightened human sympathy, and new gratitude that Jane Addams lives.

On the very day that she addressed the Women's League of Peace, Hanford MacNider, assistant secretary of war, accompanied by three major generals, arrived in Boston from Washington, to speak before the Women's Republican Club and at the Boston Chamber of Commerce in behalf of the proposed universal service law. One of his first words to the newspaper men who met him was, "I have some things to say about Jane Addams and others"; and to the Women's Republican Club he said them. Jane Addams was not qualified to speak about war and military service. "Would Jane Addams listen to me if I would tell her how to run Hull House? Yet I have been to Hull House. Jane Addams has never been to war." That sort of talk does not go down in Massachusetts. Charles Sumner, Channing, Edward Everett Hale and George F. Hoar had "never been to war"; yet their observations on the subject are still respectable and are likely to be considered long after Mr. MacNider's term as assistant secretary of war has expired.

Besides Miss Addams, Mr. MacNider mentioned by name for reproach only Mrs. Catt; but he had much to say generally about "paid pacifists," "professional pacifists," and "the pacifist delusion." One may be pardoned for doubting whether the assistant war secretary is qualified to speak about pacifism since he is quite unable to define it and seems to know nothing about it. As to "paid pacifists," they are as rare as white blackbirds. There are probably not fifty persons in the United States who receive salary or wages of any sort for peace service, exclusive of our professors of international law, of whom there are not half enough, and who for the most part are not half paid: while there are thousands of "paid" militarists, men who boom military training in schools and camps, lobby for big army and navy appropriations—President Coolidge told us about it in his Omaha speech—and denounce Jane Addams. One wonders whether Mr. MacNider himself is not "paid" for, among other things, denouncing "pacifism," with his salary coming out of the taxes, to which pacifists as well as militarists have to contribute. When Jane Addams receives a fee for a peace address, which is probably not one time in ten, the payment at any rate is voluntary; it doesn't come from the people's taxes. My opinion is that the apostles of militarism and preparedness for war ought similarly to pay their own bills or pass the contribution box. My more serious opinion is that subordinate officials in executive depart-

ments of the government have no business stumping the country on one side or the other of questions of public policy, especially controversial questions on which public opinion is sharply divided: and I suggest petitions to the President to put a stop to it. The universal service law which Mr. MacNider came to Boston to exploit, and which he went on to exploit in Albany, Buffalo, and Detroit, has not been passed by Congress, and it is to be hoped that it never will be. If President Coolidge's declaration in his Omaha speech, that "the policy of peace through reason rather than peace through force is that in which America ought always to take a leading part," means anything, then it is time for us to shape things to that end. Mr. MacNider's most salutary proposition was that when in the "next war" our young men are conscripted to be shot, our rich men shall be conscripted to the limit of their fortunes to pay the bills. This should certainly put a damper on venerable jingoism. It is an edifying prospect and should bring many rich recruits to the peace movement.

The plain people are not alive to the scope and intricacy of the proposed universal service law. The War Department, if Mr. MacNider rightly reports it, proposes "the building up of a great educational system to develop the necessary personnel to man the key positions, the gathering together of experts into great commodity committees, the enlistment of able citizens to head the various sources of supply and the war industries to bear the war-load the military gentlemen estimate will be needed for our major armies." He emphasized the point that the War Department favors the principle of universal service and "decried the professional pacifists who hamper the plans."

Throughout the war secretary's address ran the insinuation that the peace people are not good patriots. This is ridiculous. The world's great international men, Cobden, Sumner, Victor Hugo, Lessing, Mazzini, have in their various nations been the very exponents and symbols of the noblest patriotism. "You will find no service to their country in time of need," Mr. MacNider said of the "noisy" pacifists. This certainly does not apply to the women whom he singled out for opprobrium. Jane Addams was one of Hoover's chief lieutenants in the food conservation campaign. Mrs. Catt proffered the services of the Woman Suffrage Association to the President even before war was declared.

It was not creditable to the hundreds of women of the Republican Club whom Mr. MacNider addressed at their luncheon at the Copley Plaza, that no woman present arose from her salad to her feet in indignant protest and rebuke. His offence was not mitigated by his conventional tribute to their "good works in many lines of endeavor."

Why this sudden and untimely furor in the United States in behalf of preparedness for war? This strange exhibition of cowardice and tremor is degrading. Before the war it would have been inexcusable; today, when we are vastly stronger and the nations of the old world are all weaker, it is inexplicable. Mr. MacNider wished to assure Jane Addams that "our plan doesn't mean war; it is a frank declaration that we mean to have peace." That is what they all say and always have said. We do not question Mr. MacNider's sincerity; he is simply out of date. Militarism does not mean wanting war; nobody wants war. It means believing in war and preparing for war as the international method. "Unpreparedness," Mr. MacNider says, "never saved America from war." Preparedness certainly never saved any nation from war. The common judgment of the best minds in Europe today is that it was precisely what brought on the world war. Mr. Asquith, Mr. Lloyd George and Lord Grey, the three responsible English statesmen of the period, have frankly expressed their change of mind as to the real cause of the war. In the passion of 1914 they indulged and encouraged notions of German ambition for conquest, a dream of a sort of new Roman Empire, as the root of the matter, and the Versailles treaty itself was based on the theory of one guilty nation. But in 1920, two years after the war, Lloyd George had concluded that "no ruler really wanted war," but that all "staggered and stumbled" into it together; and now Lord Grey, the negotiator for England in 1914, with closer personal knowledge than any other, openly declares his conviction that neither the German Emperor, the German Chancellor, nor the German foreign minister planned war or desired it, but were the victims of the monstrous military machine they had so painfully prepared for their security. All Europe had become an armed camp, and explosion and collision were inevitable. Nations generally get what they prepare for. Europe prepared for war, and she got it.

A crusade in England, in Germany or France today for the mobilization of the industries and resources of the country for the possible event of war, compulsory military training in schools and colleges, the rallying of young men in military camps with the ostentation common here, is unthinkable. We are putting on Europe's cast-off clothing. The meticulous tuition of our butchers and bakers as to how to concentrate and rush their supplies when Japanese armies cross the Rocky Mountains or the British navy sails up the St. Lawrence were a theme for Gilbert and Sullivan, if it were not so mournful, so recreant, and so depraving. It is the creation in America, instead of our old peace psychology, of the war psychology which when ripe poisoned and ruined Europe.

But we are better than Europe! "Any sane person knows," says our cheery assistant secretary, "that we will never provoke war. America is not so constituted." What makes him think that we will never provoke war? Judging the future by the past, which is what wise men do, that is precisely what we shall do, if the temptation comes, and especially if it is re-enforced by a million adventurous cadets and well allocated bankers, marketmen and motors. We provoked the war with Mexico in 1846, which General Grant justly pronounced "one of the most unjust wars ever waged by a stronger against a weaker people." It was, he said, "a political war, and our troops were sent to provoke a fight." We precipitated the war with Spain in 1898. Jones Ford Rhodes, our best historian of the period, pronounced the war utterly unjustifiable and unnecessary; even Mark Hanna, he says, would have prevented it had he been in McKinley's place. John D. Long,

himself in McKinley's cabinet at the time, entirely agrees with Mr. Rhodes; every argument of McKinley's for pushing us into the war seemed to him an argument for keeping out of it.

What we have done in the past we shall do in the future if occasion comes, unless we turn over a new leaf and join with the large-minded and forward looking men of all nations in organizing the world and preparing for peace instead of preparing for war. We are neither better nor worse than England, France and Germany; indeed our course since the war has constantly placed us behind them and called for their forgiveness as often as for their admiration. No nation is good enough to trust itself outside of regular place and service in a rational world order; and we shall go the way that Europe went if we go back to the hoary old ways of Europe, in the hour when Europe is striving to get away from them.

Boston, Mass. EDWIN D. MEAD.

To American Friends

It is a privilege for me to enjoy the friendship of so many unknown American and European friends. It pleases me to note that the circle is ever widening, perhaps more especially in America. I had the pleasure of receiving a warm invitation about a year ago to visit that continent. The same invitation has now been repeated with redoubled strength and with the offer to pay all expenses. I was unable then as I am now to respond to the kind invitation. To accept it is an easy enough task, but I must resist the temptation, for I feel that I can make no effective appeal to the people of that great continent unless I make my position good with the intellectuals of India.

I have not a shadow of a doubt about the truth of my fundamental position. But I know that I am unable to carry with me the bulk of educated India. I can therefore gain no effective help for my country from the Americans and Europeans so long as I remain isolated from educated India. I do want to think in terms of the whole world. My patriotism includes the good of mankind in general. Therefore, my service of India includes the service of humanity. But I feel that I should be going out of my orbit if I left it for help from the West. I must be satisfied for the time being with such help as I can get from the West, speaking to it from my smaller Indian platform. If I go to America or to Europe I must go in my strength not in my weakness, which I feel today—the weakness, I mean, of my country. For, the whole scheme for the liberation of India is based upon the development of internal strength. It is a plan of self-purification. The peoples of the West, therefore, can best help the Indian movement by setting apart specialists to study the inwardness of it. Let the specialists come to India with an open mind and in a spirit of humility as befits a searcher after Truth. Then, perhaps they will see the reality instead of a glorified edition that in spite of all my desire to be absolutely truthful I am likely to present if I went to America. I believe in thought-power more than in the power of the word, whether written or spoken. And if the movement that I seek to represent has vitality in it and has divine blessing upon it, it will permeate the whole world without my physical presence in its different parts. Any way, at the present moment, I see no light before me. I must patiently plod in India until I see my way clear for going outside the Indian border.

After pressing the invitation, the American friend puts a number of questions for my consideration. I welcome them and gladly take the opportunity of answering them through these columns. He says:

"Whether you decide, now or later, to come here or not to come, I trust you will find the following questions worth considering. They have developed insistently in my mind for a long time."

His first question is:

"Has the time arrived—or is it coming—when your best way to help India will be by moving the whole world—and especially England and America—to a new Consciousness?"

I have partly answered the question already. In my opinion the time has not yet arrived—it may come any day—for me to go out of India to move the whole world to a new consciousness. The process, however, is even now indirectly and unconsciously going on though slowly.

"Are not the present-day interests of all mankind, everywhere, so inextricably interwoven that no single country, like India, can be moved far out of its present relationships to the others?"

I do believe with the writer that no single country can remain in isolation for any length of time. The present plan for securing Swaraj is not to attain a position of isolation but one of full self-realization and self-expression for the benefit of all. The present position of bondage and helplessness hurts not only India, not only England, but the whole world.

"Is not your message and method essentially a world gospel—which will find its power in responsive souls, here and there, in many countries, who will thereby, gradually, remake the world?"

If I can say so without arrogance and with due humility, my message and methods are indeed in their essentials for the whole world and it gives me keen satisfaction to know that it has already received a wonderful response in the hearts of a large and daily growing number of men and women of the West.

"If you demonstrate your message in the language only of the East and in terms only of Indian emergencies, is there not grave danger that nonessentials will be confused with fundamentals that some features which correspond only to extreme situations in India will be wrongly understood to be vital in the universal sense?"

I am alive to the danger pointed out by the writer, but it seems to be inevitable. I am in the position of a scientist who is in the midst of a very incomplete experiment and who, therefore, is unable to forecast large results and larger corollaries in a language capable of being understood. In the experimental stage, therefore, I must run the risk of the experiment being misunderstood as it has been and probably still is in many places.

"Ought you not to come to America (which in spite of all her faults is perhaps, potentially, the most spiritual of all living peoples) and tell the world what

your message means in terms of Western, as well as Eastern, civilization?"

People in general will understand my message through its results. The shortest way, therefore, perhaps of making it effectively heard is to let it speak for itself, at any rate for the time being.

"For example, should the Western followers of your inspiration preach and practice the spinning wheel?"

It is certainly not necessary for the Western people to preach and practice the spinning wheel unless they will do so out of sympathy or for discipline or with a view to applying their matchless inventive faculty to making the spinning wheel a better instrument while retaining its essential characteristic as a cottage industry. But the message of the spinning wheel is much wider than its circumference. Its message is one of simplicity, service of mankind, living so as not to hurt others, creating an indissoluble bond between the rich and the poor, capital and labor, the prince and the peasant. That larger message is naturally for all.

"Is your condemnation of railroads, doctors, hospitals and other features of modern civilization essential and unalterable? Should we not, first, try to develop a spirit great enough to spiritualize the machinery and the organized, scientific and productive powers of modern life?"

My condemnation of railroads, etc., whilst true where it stands, has little or no bearing on the present movement which disregards none of the institutions mentioned by the writer. In the present movement I am neither attacking railroads nor hospitals; but in an ideal State they seem to me to have little or no place. The present movement is just the attempt the writer desires. Yet it is not an attempt to spiritualize the machinery—because that seems to me an impossible task —but to introduce, if it is at all possible, a human or the humane spirit among the men behind the machinery. Organization of machinery for the purpose of concentrating wealth and power in the hands of a few and for the exploitation of many I hold to be altogether wrong. Much of the organization of machinery of the present age is of that type. The movement of the spinning wheel is an organized attempt to displace machinery from that state of exclusiveness and exploitation and to place it in its proper state. Under my scheme, therefore, men in charge of machinery will think not of themselves or even of the nation to which they belong but of the whole human race. Thus Lancashire men will cease to use their machinery for exploiting India and other countries but on the contrary they will devise means of enabling India to convert in her own villages her cotton into cloth. Nor will Americans under my scheme seek to enrich themselves by exploiting the other races of the earth through their inventive skill.

"Is it not possible, in conditions so favorable as America's, to clarify and advance the evolution of the best human Consciousness into such purpose and power, courage and beneficence, as shall liberate the souls of India's millions—and of all men everywhere?"

It is undoubtedly possible. Indeed it is my hope that America will seek the evolution of the best human consciousness; but that time is perhaps not yet. Probably it will not be before India has found her own soul. Nothing will please me more than to find America and Europe making the difficult path of India as easy as it is possible for them to do. They can do so by withdrawing the temptations in India's way and by encouraging her in her attempt to revive her ancient industries in her own villages.

"Why is it that people like myself, in every country, are grateful to you and eager to follow you? Is it not for two reasons, chiefly:

First: Because the next and basic need throughout the world is for a new spiritual consciousness—a realization, in the thought and feeling of average people, of the equal divinity of all human beings and the unity, brotherhood, of all?

Second: Because you, more than any other widely known man, have this consciousness—together with the power to arouse it in others?"

I can only hope that the writer's estimate is true.

"It is a world need—is it not?—to which you have the best answer that God has vouchsafed to man? How can your mission be fulfilled in India alone? If my arm or leg could be vitalized to an extent far beyond the balance of my body, would that make for my general health—or even for the permanent best good of the one favored member?"

I am fully aware that my mission cannot be fulfilled in India alone but I hope I am humble enough to recognize my limitations and to see that I must keep for the time being to my restricted Indian platform till I know the result of the experiment in India itself. As I have already replied, I would like to see India free and strong so that she may offer herself as a willing and pure sacrifice for the betterment of the world. The individual, being pure, sacrifices himself for the family, the latter for the village, the village for the district, the district for the province, the province for the nation, the nation for all.

"May I even submit,—with deep reverence for your message—that possibly your own vision and inspiration would bnefit by adjustment to the world instead of only, or chiefly, to India?"

I recognize the considerable force of the foregoing statement. It is not at all impossible that a visit to the West may give me not a wider outlook—for I have endeavored to show that it is the widest possible—but it may enable me to discover new methods of realizing the outlook. If such is my need, God will open the way for me.

"Is the political form of government, in India or anywhere, so important as the average individual's soul-force—his courageous expression of the best inspiration he can derive from the divine spirit within and all about him?"

The average individual's soul-force is any day the most important thing. The political form is but a concrete expression of that soul-force. I do not conceive the average individual's soul-force as distinguished and existing apart from the political form of Government. Hence I believe that after all a people has the Government which it deserves. In other words self-government can only come through self-effort.

"Is not the basic need, everywhere, for the clarification and development of this soul force in individuals—beginning, possibly, with a few people and spreading like a divine contagion to the many?"

It is, indeed.

"You teach, rightly, that the faithful development of such soul-force in India will assure India's freedom.

Will it not everywhere shape all political, economic and international institutions including the issues of Peace or War? Can those forms of human civilization be made radically superior in India to the rest of the world now, when all mankind are neighbors?"

I have already answered this question in the preceding paragraphs. I have claimed in these pages before now that India's freedom must revolutionize the worlds outlook upon Peace and War. Her impotence affects the whole of mankind.

"You know, better than I or anyone, how all these questions should be answered. I chiefly seek to express my eager faith in your gospel, my hungry desire for your leadership in solving the urgent problems of America and of all mankind. Therefore, will you graciously remember that, if (or when) the time may come that India's progress in the directions you have so inspiringly outlined appears to pause—waiting for the Western world to come up alongside—then we of the West stand urging you to give us a few months of your time and your personal presence. My own feeling is that if you will call us and instruct us, we (your uncounted followers scattered obscurely over the wide earth) will join our lives to yours in the discovery and realization of a new and noble, world-wide Commonwealth of the Spirit in which man's age-old dreams of Brotherhood, Democracy, Peace and Soul Progress shall, characterize the daily life of average people—in India, England, America and everywhere."

I wish I had confidence in my leadership on the world-platform. I have no false modesty about me. If I felt the call within, I would not wait a single second but straightway respond to an invitation so cordial as this. But with my limitations of which I am painfully conscious, I feel somehow that my experiment must be restricted to a fragment. What may be true of the fragment is likely to be true of the whole. It is true indeed that India's progress in the direction I desire seems to have come to a pause but I think that it only seems so. The little seed that was sown in 1920 has not perished. It is, I think, taking deep root. Presently it will come out as a stately tree. But if I am laboring under a delusion, I fear, that no artificial stimulus that my visit to America may temporarily bring can revive it. I am pining for the assistance of the whole world. I see it coming. The urgent invitation is one of the many signs. But I know that we shall have to deserve it before it comes upon us like a mighty flood, a flood that cleanses and invigorates.

Young India. *M. K. Gandhi.*

A Great Indian Scholar

Papers from India bring word of the death of Dr. R. H. Bhandakar of Poona, the eminent Orientalist. This news will interest scholars everywhere, for as an authority in the Sanskrit language and its important literature, Dr. Bhandarkar probably had no superior in the world. His death should also interest Unitarians, for he was a very eminent leader in the Brahmo Somaj, that liberal religious movement which is for India very much what the Unitarian church is for America. He died at the age of 88, having devoted twenty-five years of his life to teaching as a professor of Sanskrit in the cities of Bombay and Poona, and the last thirty-two years of archaeological, historical, and linguistic investigation and writing.

Although Dr. Bhandarkar was above all else a Sanskritist, this does not make his work narrow or limited in its importance, or confined to India in its influence; indeed it gives it almost a world-wide value, for, as is now well known, Sanskrit is the language of widest import of any in the world, being in a sense the mother of all the more important languages of Europe, and of two or more of the most important of Asia, and possessing a literature more extensive than the combined extant literatures of Greece and Rome.

For some years Dr. Bhandarkar conducted a very extensive search throughout India, in old libraries, temples, and elsewhere, for ancient or lost Sanskrit manuscripts, and succeeded in bringing to light some of great value.

He wrote much for periodicals of high scholarship and contributed many papers to learned societies, both in India and in Europe. Early in his career as a teacher, he wrote text books in Sanskrit which were widely used in schools and colleges. He was the author of one valuable work of political history—a "History of the Deccan" (a large section of western central India). His greatest works, however, which show most clearly the vast range and thoroughness of his critical scholarship deal with the rise, development, teaching, and influence of the most important of the religious sects of India.

Dr. Bhandarkar must by no means be associated wholly with the things of the past. His studies of the ancient did not prevent him from taking a keen and never failing interest in the present. He was not only an educator but an educational reformer, seeking ever for the best methods in education. He was also all his life a social reformer, giving his influence constantly against child marriage, the cruel treatment of widows and the unjust restrictions of various kinds put upon woman. He brought upon himself much opprobrium by bringing about the remarriage of a daughter who had become a widow. It was largely through his influence that two very important institutions for the benefit of women were established in Poona, namely, a women's university and a home for widows.

All his life he was conspicuously a religious reformer, opposing idolatry and caste, aiding movements for the elevation of the untouchable classes, pouring the light of knowledge and truth upon religious superstitions, with a view to ending them, and laboring incessantly by pen and by tongue to give to his country a religion in harmony with modern knowledge, that is to say, the very high and pure form of ethical theism represented by the Brahmo Somaj. In 1867, partly as the result of the efforts of Keshub Chunder Sen, the eminent Brahmo Somaj leader of Calcutta, a Somaj was organized in Bombay. Two years later, on locating in Bombay as a teacher, Prof. Bhandarkar joined it, and for fully fifty years was, perhaps more than any other person, its leader, shaping its constitution, preparing its hymn book, its prayer book and its statement of principles, inspiring its philanthropic activities, and much of the time occupying its pulpit on Sun-

day. He was an able preacher and a man of very deep and earnest piety. Largely through his activity and devotion, the Bombay Somaj (which was known locally as the Prarthana Somaj) became an institution widely known and exerting a morally elevating and religiously enlightening influence not only in the great city in which it is located but far beyond.

I have often regretted that Dr. Bhandarkar never visited America, where he would have received a warm welcome from our universities and learned societies, and certainly also from our Unitarian churches. But the distance was great, and he never liked travel. Indeed, he visited Europe only once, which was to read an important paper at an international congress of orientalists in Vienna.

In closing, I may add an item of news regarding the general Brahmo-Somaj movement in India. It is often mentioned as a remarkable coincidence that American Unitarianism and British Unitarianism were organized as national movements on the same day, a hundred years ago last May. It is interesting to know that the Brahmo-Somaj in the East had its birth only three years later than its sister liberal religious organizations in the West. Its centennial will occur in 1928, and word comes that preparations are already beginning to be made for a celebration of it in a manner calculated to attract the attention of all India.

New York City. J. T. SUNDERLAND

The Study Table

"Black Cameos"

"Black Cameos"* are sketches of black people living in Southern Louisiana and whom this author, a white man, speaks of with kindly affection. Mr. Kennedy tells us in his preface that he began to collect Negro spirituals at the age of thirteen, "and it was easy work, living as I did in a small town where the primitive types of Negro were all about and showed great willingness to let me take down their songs and comments and conversations." This book is made up of notes, bits here and there, songs, sometimes with the music, amusing anecdotes. It takes its place with Gonzales' "Black Border," the collection of Gullah tales.

Mr. Kennedy's preface is so pleasing, his emphasis on the Negro's habit of "thinking in pictures," "his naive, unhampered imagination," "his natural disregard for syntax and correct pronunciation, his graceful elisions and gentle eliminations of any harsh consonants," that one has a right, perhaps, to expect more than one receives in the bulk of the book. For the stories that he tells us, while probably wholly charming when recited by a master of the dialect, are not extraordinary when read to one's self. They often turn upon the misuse or misunderstanding of English. Take, for example, this one, called "Chivalry."

> The Saturday night "feesh fry" was in full swing. Everybody was having a good time except one lanky, lonely looking colored girl sitting over in the corner of the room. She had been a wall flower all evening.
>
> After a while a tall, dandy, black-velvet complexioned young colored man walked over to her and said:
>
> "'Scuse me, Miss young lady, but ain't yo' name Miss Magnolia Johnson?"
>
> "Yas, suh, mah name Miss Magnolia Johnson."
>
> "Well, Miss Magnolia, is yo' program fill' yet?"
>
> "No, suh, Gawd knows mah program ain' fill'. No, suh, 'cause all I bin had to eat dis evenin' was one slice o' watuh millun'."

It is in the collection of spirituals that the writer seems to me to have done most valuable service. There are sixteen given with the music and many more with only the words. Those are woven into the stories, often are a large part of the stories. In his preface Mr. Kennedy tells us "the spirituals or hymns, or 'ballets' of the Southern Negroes, are original productions which the authors go about singing from church to church, the congregation learning them by word of mouth. If they become popular, the authors have them printed on narrow strips of paper, and they are sold to the church members at five cents each. * * * Many of them attain to almost gigantic proportion in number of stanzas, fifteen to twenty being considered a small number to tell a Bible story with every intimate detail."

Mr. Kennedy believes that while some of the Creole songs of Louisiana Negroes may have a relationship to old Spanish and Provencal compositions, the devotional songs are essentially spontaneous. "They are the unpremeditated melodies that have never been learned or pondered over and worked out for artistic effect." To which we say "amen" and wish that the Hampton and Fisk quartettes, and others less famous, could take this to heart and cease to make great music commonplace by their imitation of Glee Club forms. How one does hate education when it lays irreligious hands on this noble primitive music.

Gretna, the village of which Kennedy writes, is just across the river from "big New Leens." The stories bring to remembrance the beauty that has come out of that great city from Cable, Kato, Chopin and many others. It is a land of picturesque and lovely things to which the Negro, as depicted in this book, brings his share.

MARY WHITE OVINGTON

* By R. Emmet Kennedy. Published by Messrs. Albert & Chas. Boni, New York City.

Good Sermons

Dr. Newton's book* is excellent in its way, but not at all in the way indicated by its title. This volume is no more a collection of the "best sermons" of 1925 than its predecessor was a collection of the "best sermons" of 1924. In the very nature of the case, nobody knows or can know what are the "best sermons" of any given period of time. Best poems, best short stories, best editorials, all these are duly printed in accessible papers and can be winnowed out of the available material in each case. But sermons are spoken, only occasionally printed, and no one but God himself can find the "best." What Dr. Newton has done is to seek out a group of eminent preachers and ask them to con-

* "Best Sermons 1925," edited by Joseph Fort Newton. Published by Harcourt, Brace & Company.

THE FIELD

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

Committee on Militarism in Education

Three hundred and eighty-two universities, colleges and secondary schools are listed by the War Department as maintaining some form of military training. In 197 schools attendance at drill is to some extent compulsory. Some require it for the first two years, some for the last two years, some for four years.

The actual value of this training for purposes of national defense is very low. It is even lower as a means of promoting physical health and ideals of right citizenship. But as a means of keeping alive the military view of life, its value is high. The military view of life is opposed to freedom of speech and conscience and to faith in reason and good will, as the foundation of security.

Many of our finest young students who come closest in contact with military training see this clearly. The Evanston Interdenominational Student Conference in resolutions, widely printed, declared for abolition of military training in high schools, in church and denominational schools and in all colleges including the compulsory features in Land Grant Institutions. Recently student referendums in such places as the College of the City of New York and Ohio State University have shown majorities against compulsory training.

The National Study Conference of the Churches held in Washington with representatives from 28 communions declared, "We emphatically disapprove of compulsory military training. We urge careful review of the effect of military training in all its phases." The Ohio Pastors' Association during the week the student referendum was being taken at Ohio State University and when the whole state was talking about the action of the Cleveland School Board in ousting all military training from Cleveland's schools, unanimously voted in favor of abolishing military training in all high schools and its compulsory element in colleges.

Do our churches mean business? Will they back up their own young people and their own representatives? One concrete opportunity to answer this question with an emphatic "Yes" is furnished by the existence of the Committee on Militarism in Education which issued the widely circulated pamphlet by Winthrop D. Lane. Among its members are: Dr. David Starr Jordan, President Arthur E. Morgan, Professor George A. Coe, Professor Manley C. Hudson, Professor Luther A. Weigle, Bishop Francis J. McConnell, The Reverend Walter Russell Bowie, The Reverend Ernest Tittle, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, Sherwood Eddy, Alva M. Kerr, Charles M. Sheldon, Wilbur K. Thomas and William Allen White.

The committee seeks help. This can be given by people in two ways: first, by sending name and address to Committee on Militarism in Education, 387 Bible House, Astor Place, New York City, so that the committee may know on whom to count. Second, by sending a contribution, however small, to the Emergency Fund of $5,000 which must be raised to carry on the fight against a process of militarization which unless stopped will destroy all hope of making America a leader in establishing world peace.

Signed: SAMUEL M. CAVERT,
JOHN NEVIN SAYRE.
Bible House, Astor Place,
New York City.

The White Cross, How It Started, What It Is Doing, What It Proposes

Streams of narcotics going to China moved the China Club of Seattle in 1919 to form a narcotics committee.

The committee scored right off the bat through aiding the Seattle collector of customs to get put into effect at all American ports regulations prohibiting narcotic exports to countries where certain restrictive measures were not observed, thus shutting off export to some thirteen countries, some of them heavy purchasers.

The committee soon discovered that narcotics sent out did not always stay out, but were smuggled back to the dope peddlers. This led to other measures. The Jones-Miller bill was formulated, totally prohibiting import, export and carrying across the United States. The question was asked in congress, What is the use of the bill, narcotics will be smuggled in anyway? The answer was, the bill will clear up our American record. We can then get the other nations to join in pulling up the poppy plant all over the world, and thus protect not only our own country but all other countries.

The narcotics shipments through Seattle stirred not only the China Club but the whole city. Rev. Wm. H. Bliss, rector of Trinity Parish Church, saw the necessity of a strong society that should eventually extend its influence universally, and without loss of time effected organization of the White Cross—incorporated in 1920. The new organization found a large field of effort ready to its hand through co-operation with the narcotics departments of the city and nation. Through its efforts information was furnished the authorities which resulted in the conviction of some three hundred drug peddlers and smugglers. Canon Bliss devoted himself also to addressing fraternal orders, clubs, schools and general meetings, thus extending the campaign throughout the city and state. He carried the work to adjoining states also, on all sides of the state of Washington. He inspired in support of the cause men and women in great numbers, not limited to the Northwest, who have continued their devotion to the movement, and through whom the influence of Canon Bliss will long be felt upon the nation. Canon Bliss was indefatigable on behalf of the victims of addiction. He never gave up hope of their ultimate rescue. Some instances of signal success will be called to mind by those who had the privilege of an intimate acquaintance with his efforts in those strenuous days.

At an early date the **narcotics committee of the China Club of Seattle,** merged itself in the White Cross. One of the first activities of the enlarged organization was the energetic pushing of the Jones-Miller Bill.

The bill having been passed, the

---

tribute to his anthology. The result is a collection of sermons bearing the authentic stamp of the editor's own strength and weakness. Dr. Newton likes a particular type of sermon—that of the artist, the mystic, the poet; of the prophetic type of utterance he has little understanding, and gives it no place in his volumes. "Best Sermons, 1925," marks a distinctive advance over the earlier book in the greater inclusiveness of its selection of contributors. Thus it includes a Unitarian, a Catholic, a Jew, even a layman, Glenn Frank, no one of whom had any place in the previous collection.

In every way a sounder, more interesting, more significant book is "The American Pulpit,"* which gathers together the sermons published in the *Christian Century* this past year as the work of the men selected in that magazine's poll as the twenty-five foremost living American preachers. This volume is based upon a genuine principle of selection. As a result it is the most fascinating and informing collection of sermons that we have ever read. So far as any one book can, this book represents a cross-section of the American pulpit today. Here is that pulpit at its best, as in the sermons of Charles R. Brown and Harry Emerson Fosdick; at its worst, as in the sermons of Mark A. Matthews and Newell Dwight Hillis; and in between all varieties of good, bad and indifferent. On the whole, however, Dr. Morrison's volume confirms the judgment of Dr. Newton, as expressed in his volume, that "we have a great pulpit today." J. H. H.

*Edited by Charles Clayton Morrison. Published by Macmillan.

Note

We have received a copy of the "Year Book" of the New York Craftsman's group, a collection of excellent poems by contemporary singers. It pleases us to find UNITY named as among the magazines in which some of these poems were first printed.

White Cross, through the Pacific Coast senators, memorialized congress for an international conference. (S. J. Res. 201, 7th Congress, Second Session.) There soon followed the great series of resolutions of Hon. Stephen G. Porter, chairman of the house foreign affairs committee calling a World Conference for suppression of narcotics.

The White Cross circularized the United States in support of these proposals, and when the conference finally assembled at Geneva, Switzerland, sent a mammoth petition with 300,000 names urging the total extirpation of the plants from which the drugs originate, except as found necessary for medicine and science, in the judgment of the best medical opinion of the world.

The illness of Canon Bliss, followed by his lamented death before he reached home, the first American martyr to the narcotics cause, sadly deranged our plans, but the petition was laid before the conference by others, one section by Mrs. Hollister Sturges, New York White Cross vice-president; one by Mrs. Hamilton Wright, of Washington, D. C., who was a delegate to the United States commission; a third, being the section from India, by the Rev. E. J. Dukes of London, honorary secretary of the British Society for the Suppression of Opium. This India section carried the signatures of Gandi, Tagore, Chatterjee Andrews, Singh, Paul and others, and of great political and religious organizations with 250,000 members, disposing effectively of official representations that India was indifferent to the opium question.

The White Cross constitution presents as its ultimate aim, "the complete suppression throughout the world of the use of narcotic drugs except for medical and scientific purposes." We are out not to save America alone, but the world. Indeed only by saving the world can we save America.

Each of these four elements, education at home, education abroad, suppression of drug rings, and humane treatment of addicts, is essential to our great objective. When additional lines of effort are developed the White Cross will employ every weapon that comes to its hand. As David Livingstone said about African slavery, so we now say regarding this modern world menace, crueler than slavery, deadlier than war, more insidious than venereal disease **"God bless any man, anywhere, who will do anything, to help heal this open sore of the nations."**

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS
3913 Cottage Grove
Tel. Atlantic 1876

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.
PRINTERS and BINDERS
Telephone Monroe 6940 732 W. Van Buren Street, CHICAGO

For Happy Health!

Drink a glassful of Bowman's Milk. You'll like it, for Bowman's Milk is full cream milk. It is always rich and pure. In it are the elements so necessary for happy health!
Make it a habit to drink a glass of Bowman's Milk at every meal.
Insist on
BOWMAN DAIRY COMPANY MILK

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

WRIGHT & COMPANY
STEAM DOMESTIC
COAL
TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office: 608 S. Dearborn St.
CHICAGO

DREXEL State Bank
Cottage Grove Ave. and Oakwood Blvd.
Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .
Your savings and checking account cordially invited
Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

FEBRUARY
Attentions to your wardrobe and home should include the cleansing and sanitation of garments and furnishings now showing the effects of Winter's soot and grime. Only by our new continuous flow process are the finest results obtained.
Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers
PHONE DREXEL 0231 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

Subscribe for and read UNITY

28